

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION N | O. F | ILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | | |
|--------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/768,720 | | 01/30/2004 | Reinhold Winkler | 22773 | 5117 | | |
| 535 | 7590 | 03/28/2005 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| THE FIR | M OF KAI | RL F ROSS | RAO, G NAGESH | | | | |
| 5676 RIV PO BOX | ERDALE A | VENUE | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | | X), NY 10471-090 | 1722 | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Comments | 10/768,720 | WINKLER ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | G. Nagesh Rao | 1722 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is non-final. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | • | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | , | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | or the certified copies not receive | u. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | . 🗖 . | 17-1 | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/768,720 Page 2

Art Unit: 1722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 1. Claims 1-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cotteverte (US Patent No. 6,523,997 B1) in view of Gale (US Patent No. 4,857,250).

Please note the material worked upon in the apparatus is seen as a recitation of intended use and bears no weight to the capability of the apparatus.

Cotteverte 997 teaches an apparatus as shown in Figure 1 with a housing (11) enclosing two extrusion worms (1, 2). The extrusion worms are connected to a

pair of driving shafts (3,4) synced with a pair of receiving shafts (25,26) anticipates as types of stators and having a set of teeth (27,28) and operated by a driving means.

Cotteverte 997 fails to specifically teach the use of a drive motor for operating the extrusion worms.

In a method of extrusion, Gale 250 teaches the use of a stator (Fig 1 Element 20) and rotor (Fig 1 Element 22) affixed to an extruder aiding in its rotation operation as it is driven by an AC motor (Col 10 Lines 41-56).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the device shown by

Cotteverte 997 with the motor of Gale 250 for automated processing of the device
resulting in faster processing time. Furthermore the use of one drive motor would
be sufficient for carrying out the necessary job and allowing cost reduction of parts
by using one motor rather than multiple motors for operating the device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to G. Nagesh Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2946. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin Utech can be reached on (571) 272-1137. The

Application/Control Number: 10/768,720 Page 4

Art Unit: 1722

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GNR

BENJAMIN L. HTTCH
SUPERVISORY PATENT CHAMINER
TECHNOLOGY DENJOR 1700